



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/255,987	02/23/1999	TOMONARI YOSHIMURA	325772007400	9237

7590 07/13/2004  
Barry E. Bretschneider  
Morrison & Foerster LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd.  
Suite 300  
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER

LEE, TOMMY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/255,987  
Filing Date: February 23, 1999  
Appellant(s): YOSHIMURA, TOMONARI

**MAILED**

**JUL 13 2004**

**Technology Center 2600**

---

Deborah S. Gladstein  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed May 19, 2004.

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) *Grouping of Claims***

The rejection of claims 1-7, 10, 16, 18, 19, 21-23 and 26 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

**(8) *Claims Appealed***

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

5,726,778	TANIO	3-1998
5,717,839	ICHIKAWA	2-1998
6,178,007	HARRINGTON	1-2001
5,760,913	FALK	6-1998

**(10) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1, 10, 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on September 23, 2003.

Claims 2-7, 18, 19, 22, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on September 23, 2003.

**(11) *Response to Argument***

Appellant asserts that Tanio does not disclose or suggest “a memory for storing correction data relating to combinations of the input reader and the image forming apparatus,” as recited in base claim 1 and similarly recited in base claims 16 and 21. Appellant argues that color conversion circuit 304 of Tanio only stores information relating to an individual image reader or image forming apparatus, not a combination of the two devices. Appellant further states that of the four conversion tables shown in Fig. 14, the first two tables store information related to the input device and the second two tables store information related to the output device, and that the information in the first two tables does not relate in any way to the information in the second two tables (see Appeal Brief, at page 5, second paragraph). These are the only points of contention made by Appellant.

Examiner asserts that Tanio does disclose Appellant's memory for storing correction data relating to combinations of the input reader and the image forming apparatus. The conversion tables shown in Fig. 14 are set into the color conversion circuit 304 for LUTs 304a and 304b, and the table 304c for a matrix calculation corresponding to a detected output device (column 11, lines 18-31). LUT 304a is a table for exponent calculation for correcting characteristics depending on an input device, matrix calculation table 304c is a table for matrix calculation for converting the data corrected by the LUT 304a to image data on the color space of the output device, and LUT 304b is a table for exponent calculation for correcting the image data that was converted by the matrix calculation table 304c to characteristics of the output device (column 10, lines 16-26). While LUT 304a may relate to only the input device and LUT 304b may relate to only the output device, the matrix calculation table 304c clearly provides correction data relating to the input and output devices, for it takes data from the LUT 304a and converts the data according to the output device. A 3 x 3 matrix for such a conversion is provided in each of the color conversion tables shown in Fig. 14, and thus the color conversion tables store information related to combinations of the input and output devices.

Art Unit: 2624

Appellant asserts that dependent claims 2-7, 10, 18, 19, 22, 23 and 26 are allowable because the features of the base claims are not disclosed or suggested by Tanio or any of the other cited references (see Appeal Brief, at page 5, starting at Section B, to the end of page 6). The features of the base claims alleged by the Appellant to be absent from the Tanio reference are in fact disclosed, as related above. Appellant provides no further argument regarding limitations of the dependent claims, and thus the rejection of these claims is maintained.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas D. Lee  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2624


tdl

July 9, 2004

Conferees

David K. Moore

Wenpeng Chen



BARRY E BRETSCHNEIDER  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1888

DAVID MOORE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800